

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexascins, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/037,842	01/02/2002	Dan Kikinis	1028-042-1	6723	
	7590 11/07/200 ARDULA & WERTHI	EXAM	EXAMINER		
11800 SUNRISE VALLEY DRIVE			SHAW, PEI	SHAW, PELING ANDY	
SUITE 1000 RESTON, VA	20191	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
,		2444	2444		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/07/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/037,842	KIKINIS, DAN	
Examiner	Art Unit	
PELING A. SHAW	2444	
I LEMO II. OIDWI	2	

	PELING A. SHAW	2444					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 24 October 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: The period for reply expires	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance FR 1.114. The reply must be filed	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.				
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(I).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the control of th	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS							
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);					
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti appeal; and/or 	ter form for appeal by materially red	lucing or simplifying the	ne issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).				
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		.,					
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	owable if submitted in a separate, t	•	•				
7. \(\times \) for purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s); a) \(\times \) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: pope. Claim(s) allowed: pope. Claim(s) objected to: pope. Claim(s) rejected: 103-135.		be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>none</u> . AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).				
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).						
	/Peling A Shaw/ Examiner, Art Unit 2444						

Applicant's arguments are considered, but not persuasive. Claims remain rejected as in the final action. The following notes is provided.

- a. The amendment to claim 103 is reviewed. Claim 103-113 rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph as per office action mailed on 09/10/2008 are withdrawn.
- b. In response to claim 103-135 rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st paragraph, applicant has pointed to paragraphs 30, 33 and 35 of applicant's published application for showing the limitation of "Treceiving at the remote gateway agent a client registration request from the remote proxy agent, wherein the client registration request creates a client-to-sever connection through the firewall between the remote proxy agent and the remote gateway agent". Examiner has read cited paragraphs from the publication and would read the limitation as "logged into and registered with the remote gateway" as per paragraph 33 of the publication. Claim 103-135 rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st paragraph are thus withdrawn.
- c. Applicant has argued that Grantges does not teach or suggest the limitation of "receiving at the remote gateway agent a client registration request from the remote proxy agent, wherein the client registration request creates a client-to-server connection through the firewall between the remote proxy agent and the remote gateway agent". Examiner has reviewed item b of the Response of Arguments in office action mailed on 09/10/2008. Examiner has further reviewed previous claim 92 rejection as per office action mailed on 12/26/2007. A quoted reference of Grantess. i.e.
- column 6, lines 37-67, is used to covered the limitation of "connecting a proxy server to a second network, wherein the first and second network may each access the other". Examiner has noted "the application gateway connected with proxy server". Grantges has stated "Gateway 33 includes gateway proxy server 40 and gateway web server 44. Gateway yorsy server 40 is configured to establish second secure connection 54 across firewall system 32 with DMZ proxy server 34". Thus Grantges has taught or suggested the argued limitation as quoted above.